

For someone to work for the same company for 66 years is truly incredible.

One of my constituents, Clyde Tidwell, recently retired from the Alcoa Company, where he worked since May 16, 1941.

I want to congratulate him on his well-deserved retirement.

I also want to salute him for his contributions to our Country and its economy.

This Nation is a better place because of Clyde Tidwell, who I believe can accurately be called a great American.

I would like to include the following article about Mr. Tidwell that ran in the Knoxville News-Sentinel on May 16, 2007 and call it to the attention of my colleagues and the other readers of the RECORD.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, May 16, 2007]

IT'S TIGER'S TURN: AFTER 66 YEARS AT ALCOA, TIDWELL'S JOB IS DONE
(By Michael Silence)

Clyde "Tiger" Tidwell today hangs up the hard hat after working 66 years at Alcoa Tennessee.

At 87, and with his son having retired three years ago, Tidwell figures it's time to put away the safety goggles and the earplugs.

When he began May 16, 1941, he made 55 cents an hour, and a meal cost 25 cents. Tidwell was 21.

He felt fortunate because the week he started, pay increased by 10 cents an hour.

"That was pretty good" for that time, the Blount County resident said Tuesday.

Tidwell is believed to be Alcoa Inc.'s longest active employee. The company is hosting a reception for him today.

While he describes himself as timid, Tidwell said he appreciates the gesture and he will have family and friends at the reception.

He took a break from work in 1944 to serve as a paratrooper with the 82nd Airborne in World War II.

The overhead crane operator and machinist attributes his longevity to a good job and working with good people.

"I enjoyed the work and the people," he said in an interview at Alcoa's North Plant.

Pittsburg-based Alcoa Inc.'s Blount County operation, which produces aluminum used for beverage cans, and its primary metals and materials management office in Knoxville employ about 1,850 workers.

Tidwell said the biggest change at Alcoa during his years with the company were the safety measures. When he started in 1941, the plant didn't have such things as safety belts and a sprinkler system, which it now does.

And, he added, there's one building in the factory now that if a gate is opened the mill shuts down.

Tidwell served in the Army several months in 1944. During that time his daughter, Judy Lynn Carter of Knoxville, was born while he was at sea headed to Europe. It was seven months before he learned of her birth.

Tidwell said during the 66 years he's worked for Alcoa there have been some "not too rosy" events. Two thirds of the people he started work with have died.

Tidwell himself has had two heart surgeries, but on Monday, he visited the doctor and got "a clean bill of health."

Now that he has some time on his hands, Tidwell said he might get back into some farming. He used to raise tobacco but has no crops now.

He never thought of retirement, but Alcoa came along with an attractive incentive plan, so he took it.

And he said it's probably time to retire. His son, Clyde Eugene Tidwell, retired from TVA three years ago.

As much as their health allows, Tidwell and his wife, Floy, want to do some traveling and spend some time at their boathouse on Fort Loudon Lake.

"We haven't loafed around a lot," he said of those years.

And he added, "Life has been good to me."

Looking back—Other events of 1941, the year Clyde "Tiger" Tidwell started working for Alcoa Inc.: Japanese attack Pearl Harbor; Cheerios introduced by General Mills as Cheerios; Orson Welles' film Citizen Kane premieres; Joe DiMaggio's 56-game hitting streak; and Joan Baez and Vice President Dick Cheney were born.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2008

SPEECH OF

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 16, 2007

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1585) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes:

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, yesterday, as part of the Defense Authorization bill, we voted on an amendment offered by Mr. DEFazio of Oregon that would, with limited exceptions, require the President to obtain congressional authorization before taking military

action against Iran. I want to make something crystal clear: I fully support the intent of the amendment. However, I opposed the DeFazio Amendment for three reasons.

First by singling out Iran, the amendment created a troubling implication that the President could take military action against other countries without congressional authorization. For example, there have been reports that the Bush Administration has considered military action against Syria. The DeFazio Amendment did not mention Syria. Does the omission of Syria, or any other country, give the President a green light to attack other nations without congressional authorization? Essentially, the DeFazio Amendment re-stated what I believe to be the powers of the Congress under the U.S. Constitution and statutory law. The Executive Branch must respect those powers. It establishes a bad precedent for the Congress to pass a DeFazio type amendment every time it is concerned the Executive Branch might take military action against a particular country in violation of the Constitution and statutory law. That would send the wrong message that Congress doesn't care whether the Executive abides by the Constitution unless the Congress passes a similar amendment in every instance.

Second, it is difficult to predict every possible contingency when formulating legislation regarding the use of military force. If, for example, the DeFazio Amendment became the law of the land, and American civilians were taken hostage in Iran, the President would be prohibited from ordering a military rescue operation unless the Congress first passed a resolution. Certainly, that was not the intent of Mr. DEFazio's amendment, but that is its effect.

Finally, the DeFazio Amendment does not address the problem that led to the bad decision to go to war in Iraq. Afterall, President Bush asked Congress to authorize the use of force against Iraq. The problem was that Congress mistakenly passed a resolution giving the President that authority.

In conclusion, while I support the spirit and intent of this amendment, I think it establishes an unwise precedent, fails to consider all the contingencies that might lead to the justifiable use of force, and fails to address the issue that led to the war in Iraq.